IV. The genera of Coleoptera studied chronologically (1735-1801). By G. R. CROTCH, M.A.

[Read 3rd January, 1870.]

HAVING been engaged for some time in the preparation of a complete list of the genera proposed in Zoology, commencing naturally with the Entomological ones, I was very glad to see in the "Proceedings," a report of the interesting discussion on Mr. Kirby's paper (Proc. Ent. Soc. 1868, p. xlii). With Mr. Dunning's note (pp. xlvxlviii) I agree entirely, and it has been suggested to me, that a brief sketch of my work, so far as relates to the *Coleoptera*, might not be uninteresting. All exact references, etc., are omitted, to appear in the work itself.

A genus appears to me to consist of but one species *necessarily*, viz. its type; round which we arbitrarily group any number of others, which may be removed at pleasure; it is therefore defined, not so much by characters, which vary with our knowledge, but by the selection of a type-species; from which I argue, that genera proposed in Catalogues, on *previously described* species, are entitled to priority. It is certainly far less productive of confusion, that a number of genera should be published, as in Dejean's Catalogue, with their species, than as in Latreille's "Précis," with their characters only.

In tracing the types of the various genera, I find that Linnæus apparently had no idea of types, and that his genera varied considerably in their extent. I have traced them from the first edition of the Systema Nature in 1735, which is, I think, the only consistent starting point, though possibly not the most desirable one; but certainly Linnæus and his contemporaries date the introduction of genera from that work, and in the tenth edition he mentions expressly, as a novel feature, that he now introduces trivial names also; (they had, however, been employed for five or six years in his various dissertations, etc.). It is, nevertheless, unfortunate that he should have changed his opinions as he did. Geoffroy, in 1762, seems to have had a clear conception of types, figuring the typical species always, as did also Schæffer four years later, adding rough dissections; these authors, therefore, settle most of the Linnæan genera. Fabricius never

TRANS. ENT. SOC. 1870.—PART I. (MARCH.)

gave any types (except a few in the Entomologia Systematica emendata) till his final work; where he generally gives the dissection of some one species. Olivier figures the typical species, with its details, in all cases, thus defining many Fabrician genera; unfortunately, he has two or three types in the larger genera. Latreille, however, with that breadth of view which distinguished him, at once saw that the mere multiplication of species had gone far enough, and in 1802 re-defined the existing genera, and added the typical species; this was still more marked in his fourth revision, or "Considérations Générales," in which he gives a simple list of genera, with the type species added. I would only mention further, that the utmost laxity prevails in the citations of genera, the references being singularly inexact in point of date; Agassiz's Nomenclator, perhaps the most careful work of the kind, has several hundred inaccuracies in the Colcoptera alone, the various works of Latreille being an especial stumbling-block.

1735. Linnæus in the first edition of his Systema Naturæ, gives twenty-three genera of Coleoptera, one other (Lampyris) being placed in the Hemiptera.

The principal species is generally indicated, but that this is not to be relied on, is shown by the list of Swedish species published in the following year, in the "Acta Upsaliensia," where their complete heterogeneity is manifest. The genera now founded are, Blatta (Blaps mortisaga), Dytiscus, Meloe, Forficula (including Staphylinus), Notopeda (Alaus oculatus), Mordella, Curculio (no type), Buceros (Oryetes nasicornis), Lucanus, Scarabæus (including Dermestes), Dermestes (Necrophorus vespillo), Cassida, Chrysomela, Coccionella, Gyrinus, (including Haltica), Necydalis (Clerus formicarius), Attelabus (Tenebrio molitor), Cantharis (C. vesicatoria), Carabus, Cicindela (Buprestis mariana), Leptura, Cerambyx, Buprestis.

Now on elucidating these further by the Elenchus animalium, we find Dermestes including D. lardarius, as it clearly ought to do, being an old name of Gœdart's for that species. Necydalis is a magazine, including Rhaqium, Clerus, Panagaus and Attelabus coryli. Attelabus is almost worse, since besides Tenebrio it includes Spondylis, one Elater, and three Chrysomelæ. Cicindela includes the modern Cicindela and Buprestis. Buprestis consists of Carabus and Callidium. 1740. In the second edition the order of the genera is entirely altered; *Lucanus* and *Buceros* are merged in *Scarabæus*; in the *Hemiptera*, *Staphylinus* is used for the modern *Blatta*, despite the fact that Ray's *Staphylinus* was our *Ocypus olens*.

1747. In the sixth edition, Gyrinus and Lampyris are further suppressed, Elater supplants Notopeda, and Tenebrio is proposed for the original Blatta (the modern Blaps), a signification it long retained. Necydalis is now used for N. minor; Buprestis is transferred to the modern genus, plus Spondylis buprestoides; Staphylinus is used in the original sense of Ray.

1758. In the tenth edition only two genera are added, *Hister* and *Silpha*.

1762. Geoffroy, in his *Histoire abrégée*, divides the *Coleoptera* into fifty genera, displaying a degree of acumen far in advance of his age, which was but little appreciated by his contemporaries; the ill-concealed jealousy of Linnæus is only too evident in his twelfth edition. Olivier and Latreille succeeded in restoring the majority of Geoffroy's names, but there are still several which must be adopted. The new genera are—

Platycerus (Lucanus cervus), Ptilinus, Copris, Attelabus (=Hister, L.), Byrrhus (Anobium domesticum), Anthrenus, Cistela (Byrrhus pilula), Peltis (=Silpha), Cucujus (=Buprestis, L.), || Buprestis (=Carabus, L.), Bruchus (Ptinus fur), || Cicindela (Telephorus fuscus), Omalisus, Hydrophilus (H. piceus), Melolontha (Clytra 4-punctata), Prionus, Stenocorus (Leptura meridiana), Luperus [Lyperus], Cryptocephalus, Crioceris (C. 12-punctata), Altica (Podagrica fuscipes), Galeruca (G. tanaceti), Mylabris (Bruchus pisi), Rhinomacer, Bostrichus (B. capucinus), Clerus (C. apiarius), Anthribus (Brach. scabrosus), Scolytus, Anaspis, Tritoma (Mycetophagus 4-pustulatus), Diaperis, Pyrochroa, Notoxus, Cerocoma.

He also defines certain Linnæan genera as follows:-Tenebrio (Asida rugosa), Curculio* (Cleonus nebulosus), Staphylinus (Ocypus olens), Cerambyx (C. alpinus), Peltis (Silpha 4-punctata), Cucujus (Buprestis rustica), Elater (Ludius ferrugineus), Buprestis (Carabus auratus), Chry-

* This was kept for *Cleonus* by Fabricius and Germar, and ought to be retained.

somela (C. sanguinolenta), Cantharis (C. vesicatoria), Necydalis (Malthodes sanguinolentus). These are all correct except Tenebrio (where Geoffroy's type was unknown to Linnæus), and Necydalis. Platycerus and Peltis, often attributed to Geoffroy, must either be rejected as synonyms, or, if allowed to remain, be quoted from Latreille and Illiger, who revived them. The others ought to be all retained.

1763. Scopoli proposes the genus Laria for Bruchus pisi and Pria dulcamaræ.

1766. Schæffer, in his Elementa, proposes Telephorus for Cicindela of Geoffroy.

1767. Linnæus, in his twelfth edition, proposes one new genus, *Hispa* (*H. atra*). He also revives *Lucanus*, *Gyrinus* and *Lampyris* from the first edition, and selects three of Geoffroy's 28 new genera to be retained, carefully altering the names even of these, viz., *Ptinus*, which includes *Byrrhus* and *Bruchus* of Geoffroy (*Byrrhus* being the type, as is apparent from the characters given); *Byrrhus*, which includes *Anthrenus* and *Cistela* of Geoffroy (*Anthrenus* being the type); and *Bruchus*, which is equal to *Mylabris* of Geoffroy. It would be difficult to imagine a more complete confusion than was caused by this procedure, and it only required Fabricius to give a third meaning to *Byrrhus* and *Ptinus* to render it perfect.

1772. Pallas, in his Spicilegia, proposed the genus Ligniperda, to include Bostrichus capucinus and typographus.

1774. De Geer, in his *Mémoires* (vol. iv.), proposed two new genera, both of which were rejected by Fabricius, and then re-created under other names. Attempts have been made to restore De Geer's names, but, as yet, without success. The two are, *Colliuris* (*Casnonia pennsylvanica*), and *Ips* (*Tomicus typographus*). Brullé restored the first, and Marsham the last.

1775. Linnæus, in his last publication, the Bigæ Insectorum, founded the genus Paussus.

Fabricius, in the Systema Entomologiæ, raised the number of genera to eighty-three, but if he had attended more to the labours of his predecessors, the nomenclature would not now be in an almost hopeless state of embarrassment. He rarely gives types, which are chosen here from Olivier and Latreille. For example, he takes up the name *Byrrhus* from Geoffroy, and applies it to *Cistela*, Geoff., the *Byrrhus* of Linnæus being an *Anthrenus*. One could imagine he had never seen Geoffroy's work, since he cites his description and figure of *Mycetophagus* 4-pustulatus as a synonym to *Tritoma bipustulata*, F., and his description of *Byrrhus pilula* to *Dascylus cervinus*. In all, he adds 39 genera—

Trox, || Melolontha [nec Geoff.], Trichius, Cetonia, Apate (A. muricata), Melyris, Anobium [= Byrrhus, Geoff., Ptinus, Linn.], || Byrrhus [nec Geoff.; = Cistela, Geoff.], †Ptinus [nec Linn., = Bruchus, Geoff.], Elophorus, Sphæridium, †Tritoma [nec Geoff.], Nicrophorus, Opatrum, Nitidula, Alurnus, || Cistela [nec Geoff.], Erotylus (E. fasciatus, F., 1801), Lagria, Zygia, Zonitis, Apalus, || Spondylis, Lamia (L. textor, Oliv.), Calopus, Rhagium, Saperda (S. populnea, Oliv.), Callidium (C. sanguineum, Oliv.), Donacia, Lymexylon, || Cucujus [nec Geoff.], Malachius, †Necydalis [nec Linn., = Œdemera, Oliv.], Elaphrus, Scarites, Sepidium, Pimelia, Scaurus, Blaps, Helops, Erodius, Lytta [=Cantharis, Linn.], || Mylabris [nec Geoff.], Oxyporus, Pæderus.

1777. Schæffer, in his Appendix, adds four genera, Buprestoides [= Melasis, Oliv.], Cleroides (Clerus formicarius), Dermestoides (Orthopleura sanguinicollis), Elateroides [=Hylocoetus]. Of these, the first is inadmissible; the others should be retained.

Fabricius, in his Genera Insectorum, adds no new genera, but adopting the name $\dagger Ips$ from De Geer, proceeds to apply it to a curious mixture of Nitidula, Engis, etc. The generic character given is still more embarrassing, as he says that they live in carcases.

Scopoli, in his Introductio, adds the genus Lethrus for Scarabæus cephalotes, and in the Appendix he also adds Gibbium for a new species of Ptinus, Fab.

1778. Czempinski, in his *Dissertatio inauguralis*, also forms the last mentioned genus, under the name *Scotias*.

De Geer, in the seventh volume of his *Mémoires*, forms the genus *Antipus*, now regarded as a *Clytra*.

1781. Fabricius, in the Species Insectorum, adds the genus Manticora.

Pallas, in the first fasciculus of the *Icones*, proposes Mylaris for *Tenebrio gigas*, L.; and *Silphoides* for *Scarabæus sabulosus* [=*Trox*, Fab.].

Laicharting, in the first volume of the Verzeichniss, re-names three genera, Ostoma [=Nitidula, Fab.], Clytra [=Melolontha, Geoff.], Adimonia [=Galeruca, Geoff.]. It is the custom to use this last name for Galeruca tanaceti, etc., but that is the type of Geoffroy's genus, of which Adimonia is a mere synonym.

Acharius, in the Acta Holmiensia, founds the genus Bulbocerus [=Lethrus, Scop.].

1783. Herbst, in his Verzeichniss, proposes two new genera, but the names of both were pre-occupied, || Dermestoides [=Lyctus, Fab.], and || Silphoides [=Myceto-phagus, Hellw., Tritoma, Geoff.].

Piller, in the Iter per Poseganam, indicates four genera, three of which should be employed : Meloides [= Cerocoma, Geoff.], Denticollis [= Campylus, Fisch.], Corticeus, [= Hypophlæus, Fabr.], Tenebrioides (T. mauritanica, Lin., complanata, Pill.). This last is very useful, as Trogosita, Oliv., is always used wrongly, his type being T. cærulea, and consequently being co-extensive with Temnochila, Westw.

1784. Laicharting, in his second volume, adds the genus *Clytus* for *Callidium arcuatum*, etc.

Hellenius, in the Acta Holmiensia, proposes a new genus, Serropalpus (S. striatus).

Horbst, in his Mantissa, proposes Lepturoides [= Denticollis, Pill., Campylus, Fisch.], and Pterophorus [= Lymexylon].

Hochenwarth, in his *Beiträge*, indicates by name only the genus *Clunipes* [=Lethrus, Scop.].

1787. Fabricius, in the Mantissa, proposes three new genera, Brentus, Lycus (L. latissima, etc.), and Horia. Olivier, in characterizing Lycus, took Dictyoptera sanguinea for the type, a species not in the Fabrician genus, which should be kept for L. latissima. He also (and in this he was followed by Fabricius) re-modelled Horia upon H. maculata, a species likewise unknown at the date of the foundation of the genus, which must have for its type H. testacea, and thus = Cissites, Latr.

Thunberg, in the Museum Upsaliense, proposes Hydrous for H. piceus [=Hydrophilus, Geoff.].

1788. Swederus, in the Acta Holmiensia, defines the genus Cerapterus.

1789. Thunberg, in his *Periculum Entomologicum*, describes three genera, *Auchenia* [= *Crioceris*, Geoff.], *Eurychora* (*E. ciliata*), and *Calolymus* [= *Lymexylon*, Fab.].

Olivier, in the fourth volume of the *Encyclopédie*, describes *Brachycerus* and *Macrocephalus*. He also, in the first volume of his *Entomologie*, describes the genus *Hexodon*.

1790. Fabricius, in the first volume of the Danish Skrivter, describes six so-called new genera, of which two are merely appropriated from Geoffroy: || Ligniperda [nec Pallas, = Sinodendron, Hellw.], Tetratoma, Diaperis [Geoffroy], Anthribus [Geoffroy], || Scolytus [nec Geoffroy, = Epactius, Schn., Omophron, Latr.], Hypophlæus [= Corticeus, Pill.]. He selects A. albinus as a type of Anthribus, but it was not known at all by Geoffroy.

Preyssler, in his Verzeichniss, figures the genus Claviger.

Olivier, in the second volume of his Entomologie, adds six genera: Trogossita (T. cærulea), Scaphidium, Tillus, Drilus, Melasis, Cebrio. † Ips is here used for the family Colydiidæ.

Scriba, in his Journal, forms the genus Valgus.

1791. Olivier, in the sixth volume of the *Encyclopédie*, describes the genus *Dryops* (type *D. auriculatus*), being thus a clear year in advance of Fabricius.

Schneider, in his Magazin, proposes several genera in the notes. Platystomus (Curculio albinus and latirostris), Epactius [Scolytus, Fab., nec Geoff.], Rhynchites (R. Bacchus, etc.).

1792. Bosc, in the Journal d'Histoire Naturelle, forms the genus Ripiphorus on R. subdipterus. Why this name has been transferred to R. paradoxus or R. flabellatus it is difficult to see; those species must retain the names Metœcus and Emmenadia respectively, and Myodites will disappear.

Olivier, in the third volume of his *Entomologie*, adds only two genera, *Cossyphus* and *Edemera*. The type of *Œdemera* is unquestionably *O. femorata*, and the modern *Œdemera* of Schmidt should be re-named. *Serropalpus* is here described from *Melandrya canaliculata*.

Fabricius, in the Actes de la Societé d'Histoire Naturelle de Paris, describes several genera, some of which are quoted from his previous paper; many misprints appear to occur; the two new ones are Cylonium and Lygdus, afterwards altered to Colydium and Lyctus.

Fabricius, in the first volume of his *Entomologia systema*tica, adds the genera *Parnus* [=Dryops, Oliv.], and *Heterocerus*. The latter is quoted from Bosc, who however has nowhere described it.

Hellwig, in Schneider's Magazin, characterizes Mycetophagus and Synchyta, the last being a name given to include three genera which he had formerly separated, and hence having no type.

Kugelann, in the same work, proposes the genus Serrocerus [=Dorcatoma, Herbst].

Schneider, also in the same work, proposes || Elateroides for Hallomenus humeralis, and || Pentatoma for Liodes humeralis; both names were, however, pre-occupied.

Herbst, in the fourth volume of his Natursystem, describes seven new genera: Megatoma, Dorkatoma (D. dresdensis), Pselaphus, Korynetes (K. violaceus), Trichodes [=Clerus, Geoff.], Kryptophagus (Triplax anea), and || Strongylus. Of these Strongylus was pre-occupied; Megatoma was founded on a male character only, and had no type; Latreille'accepted it, and changed the name to Attagenus (type A. undatus), then (1810) he formed it into a separate genus (type M. serra). Corynetes is identical with Necrobia, and does not include the C. cæruleus, De Geer. Cryptophagus is clearly formed on Triplax anea, and has only two of the modern genus Cryptophagus in it, together with other forms; Paykull, who next defined the genus, gives the dissections from Triphyllus punctatus.

1793. Herbst, in the fifth volume, continues to establish eight new genera. Latridius (L. longicornis), Kateretes (K. ater), Ryzophagus, Monotoma (M. striata), Bitoma (B. unipunctata), Eccoptogaster [= Scolytus, Geoff.], Platypus, and Triplax. Latridius is certainly formed on a Corticaria, Cateretes on an Atomaria, Monotoma is our modern Synchyta as is clear from Hellwig's paper, and Bitoma = Lyctus.

Fabricius, in the second volume of his Entomologia, adds five genera: Sagra, † Dryops [nec Oliv.], Passalus, Molorchus (M. major), and Upis. Colydium and Lyctus are only alterations from Cylonium and Lygdus. The type of Colydium is, however, Aulonium sulcatum, and not C. elongatum. Lyctus is heterogeneous, and has no type.

1794. Fabricius, in the Appendix to the same work, gives a new genus *Cychrus*, with erroneous characters.

Panzer, in his Fauna, briefly describes the genus Hallomenus (H. humeralis).

Kugelanu, in Schneider's Magazin, describes seven new genera: Trixagus, || Volvoxis, Cychramus, Scymnus, Brachypterus, Hydræna, and Bryaxis. The first of these has been used for Throscus, but a comparison of his description will show that he rather meant Byturus. Bryaxis is rather Bythinus, Leach, than anything else.

1795. Herbst, in his sixth volume, describes Rhyncophorus (R. palmarum).

Olivier, in the fourth volume of his *Entomologie*, describes *Necrobia* (type *N. violacea* = *cærulea*, De G.). Hence *Corynetes* and *Necrobia* have been just reversed.

Hellwig, in his edition of the Fauna Etrusca, defines Endomychus, Rhynchites, Ptomaphagus (P. sericeus), Bolitophagus (B. agricola). Thus Ptomaphagus is the earliest of the four names applied to Catops.

1796. Latreille, in the first of his works, the Précis des Caractères Génériques, enumerates 148 genera, twenty-one being new: Geotrupes, Proteinus, Dacne (Engis humeralis), Choleva [= Ptomaphagus, Hellw.], Orthocerus, Eledona [=Bolitophagus, Hellw.], Pedinus, Leiodes (Anis. picea, Ill.), Cnodalon, Pytho, Throscus, Dascillus, Elodes (E. pallidus), Uleiota, Cis, Phloiotribus, Cercus [=Brachypterus, Kugel.], Byturus [Trixagus, Kugel.], Lesteva, Drypta, and Stenus. Dacne ought to be kept for Engis; Pedinus is founded on Crypticus quisquilius, which is left as the type in his two succeeding works; Byturus is at least as bad as Kugelann's genus, for he includes Meligethes in it.

TRANS. ENT. SOC. 1870.—PART I. (MARCH.)

Е

1797. Andersch, in Hoppe's Taschenbuch, proposes the name Boleticola for Silpha grossa, etc., which must be accepted.

Herbst, in his seventh volume, adds Apion, Psoa, Kolon, and Boros.

Thunberg, in the Acta Holmiensia, characterizes Cordyle [=Rhynchophorus, Herbst].

1798. Clairville, in the Entomologie Helvétique, proceeds to subdivide Curculio into several genera, viz., Cossonus, Calandra (C. granaria), Cionus (C. blattariæ), Rhynchænus (R. xylostci), Ramphus, Platyrhinus, Mycterus. Of these, all are retained except Rhynchænus, which, however, must be, if priority is to be observed. Rhinomacer he defines from Apion frumentarium, and Anthribus from Salpingus ruficollis.

Fabricius, in his Supplementum, adds four genera, † Geotrupes [nec Latreille], Onitis (O. clinias, Sturm), Lema (L. merdigera, F., 1801), and Dircæu (L. barbatum, F., 1801). He also gives as his own, Endomychus (Hellwig) and Clytra (Laicharting). Lema is co-extensive with Orioceris, Geoff., and Dircæa identical with Serropalpus, Hellenius.

Illiger, in the Verzeichniss der Käfer Preussens, gives really tangible generic characters. The new genera are Oryctes [= Buceros, L.], Aphodius (A. fossor), Anisotoma (A. glabra and humeralis), Agathidium (= Volvoxis, Kug.), Sarrotrium [= Orthocerus, Latr.], and Spercheus (Kugel.). Anisotoma and Leiodes are interchanged by Erichson, and should be reversed. He proposed to use Peltis for Silpha grossa; Latreille (1803) objecting to this, proposed Thymalus. Kugelann appears to have had clearer ideas about the Melandryadæ than most people of his time, and proposed Brontes for Serropalpus lævigatus [= Dircæa, Muls., Hypulus, Payk.] and Mystaxis for S. dubius and bifasciatus [= Hypulus, Muls.].

Paykull, in the first volume of his Fauna, forms five new genera, the types being carefully indicated: Oducantha, Xylita (X. buprestoides, Fab.), Hypulus (H. 4-guttatus), Anthicus (A. monoccros), Catops (C. sericea). Hypulus is evidently Dircæa, Muls. (nec Fabr.) and Brontes, Kugel., hence Hypulus, Muls., might take Kugelann's name Mystaxis. Anthicus = Notoxus, Geoff., and Catops=Ptomaphagus, Hellw.

Schrank, in his Fuuna Boica, proposes four genera, Pilularius [= Copris], Involvulus [= Rhynchites], Salius [= Rhynchænus = Orchestes], Gymnopterion [= Molorchus].

1799. Creutzer, in the Entomologische Versuche, characterizes Actinophorus from A. sacer, etc., in which he was followed by Sturm, and has two years priority over Weber. He also proposes Orchestes for Rynchaenus, Clairv., and states that the MS. name Pedetes was likewise in use for it.

Cuvier, in his Tableau Élémentaire, proposes the genus Platycephalus [=Aphodius].

Herbst, in his eighth volume, adds three genera, Akis, Machla and Stenosis.

Fröhlich, in the Naturforscher, defines five genera as new, but his paper not being published for some years, he was preceded by others: Leistus, Lithophilus, Agyrtes, || Luperus [=Ptomaphagus], || Adimonia [=Dascylus, Latr.].

Paykull, in his second volume, adds || Helodes [nec Latreille], Atopa [=Dascylus, Latr.], Cyphon [=Elodes, Latr.], and Dasytes (D. niger).

1800. Paykull, in his third volume, further adds Engis [=Dacne, Latr.], and Phalacrus (P. coruscus).

1801. Fabricius, in his final work, the Systema Eleutheratorum, adds a number of new genera, for the most part with their types indicated: Chelonarium, Platynotus, Melandrya, Galerita, Agra, || Hydrachna, Imatidium, Adorium [=Oides, Weber], Colaspis, Aegithus, Allecula, Cupes, || Brontes [= Uleiota, Latr.], Trachys, Æsalus, Gnoma, Megalopus, Hylesinus, Lixus. He also uses † Rhynchænus (nec Clairv.) and † Collyris (nec De Geer).

Weber, in his Observationes, characterizes at length eight genera: Ateuchus [= Actinophorus], Anthia, Tachypus [= Carabus], Calosoma, Brachinus, Oides, Eumolpus, Eumorphus. Fabricius changed Oides into Adorium, but without giving any reason.

Lamarck, in his Système, proposes Goliathus for Scarabœus Goliathus [= Hegemon, Harris].

Е 2

Knoch, in his Neue Beyträge, defines three new genera, Cremastocheilus, Chlamys, and Sundalus.

Brongniart, in the Bulletin de la Société Philomathique, describes the genus Dasycerus.

Palisot de Beauvois, in the Magasin Encyclopédique, describes the genus Atractocerus.

In accordance with the practice of Dr. Leconte, the sign \parallel is prefixed to the names of genera previously occupied, and the sign \dagger to names quoted erroneously from earlier authors.

NOTE.-- I may refer here to a recent work of Mr. Thorell's on European spiders (Nov. Act. Ups. vii. 1.), in which he examines the question of nomenclature at some length. He shows that the trivial name was instituted by Linnæus in his Philosophia Botanica (1751), which date he accordingly recognizes; and for genera he adopts Sundevall's view, that the first edition of the Systema Nature (1735) must be recognized, "as being that in which for the first time real genera are arranged and defined consistently throughout the animal kingdom." In discussing the minor points, he considers that a name, if sunk as a synonym, does not become therefore free, but may only be used for a subdivision of the same genus. He admits also certain degrees of emendation of badly formed names, protesting altogether against hybrids and anagrams. Altogether the paper shows that a real study of nomenclature is gradually being inaugurated.